

Serial No. 10/628,034  
Docket No. 60655.0900

### Remarks

Applicants reply to the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005 within three months. Applicants seek reconsideration of the Application in view of the remarks below. In this reply, Applicants do not amend, cancel, or add any new claims. Accordingly, claims 1-23 remain pending.

### Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174030 A1, filed by Praisner, et al. ("*Praisner*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner characterizes *Praisner* as disclosing each of the elements of independent claims 1 and 12, and specifically disclosing "reducing said parent spending power by an amount less than said subsidiary spending capacity" (See Paper No. 07242005, pages 2-3 citing *Praisner*, paragraphs [0128] to [0131] and [0150] to [0170]). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of *Praisner*.

Applicants submit that *Praisner* discloses a system wherein a bank sets a "master credit limit" for an entity, and the entity provides a "dynamic payment card" to employees to allow execution of any company-approved transactions, such that the dynamic payment card "preserves existing purchasing card functionality including standard credit limits on a per card basis" (*Praisner*, paragraph [0128], emphasis added). Furthermore, in the example provided by *Praisner* beginning in paragraph [0151], the master credit limit is \$200,000, and this \$200,000 credit limited is not affected by employees Mary, Ann, Tom, Sam, Sally, and/or any other employee having access to the master credit limit. Thus, Applicants submit *Praisner* discloses multiple cards being distributed to employees, wherein each employee has a credit limit associated with the employee, however, the credit limit extended to each employee has no affect on the master credit limit. In other words, the master credit limit disclosed in *Praisner* will always be \$200,000. Accordingly, *Praisner* fails to disclose or suggest at least "reducing... said parent spending power by an amount less than said subsidiary spending capacity" as similarly recited in claims 1, 11 and 12 (emphasis added).

Claims 2-10 and 13-23 each directly or indirectly depend from independent claims 1 and 12, and contain all of the elements thereof. Therefore, Applicants

Serial No. 10/628,034  
Docket No. 60655.0900

respectfully submit claims 2-10 and 13-23 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (602) 382-6389.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2814 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

REG. NO 39,038

Dated: August 24, 2005

By: 

Jason R. Graff, Reg. No. 54,134

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
400 E. Van Buren  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Phone: 602-382-6389  
Fax: 602-382-6070  
Email: jgraff@swlaw.com

GRAFF/PHX1712155.2  
AXP No. 200301835